UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 09/815,591
Filing Date: March 23, 2001
Appellant(s): SPIVAK ET AL.

Terrence L. Wong
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 02/09/09 appealing from the Office action mailed 09/18/09.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,446,061	DOERRE et al	09-2002
5,982,507	WEISER et al	11-1999
6,418,433	CHAKRABARTI et al	07-2002
6,675,162	RUSSELL-FALLA et al	01-2004
6,473,730	MCKEOWN et al	10-2002

W3C, "Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0", 02/10/98, pp. 1-2, http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-xml-19980210

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, 10-16, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doerre et al (US-6,446,061 09/03/02) in view of Weiser et al (US-5,982,507

11/09/99) in further view of Chakrabarti et al (US-6,418,433 07/09/02) in further view of Russell-Falla et al (US-6,675,162 01/06/04) in further view of McKeown et al (US-6,473,730 10/29/02).

-In regards to independent claims 1, 7, and 14, Doerre et al teaches a computer implemented method comprising a processor and memory connected to said processor, wherein the method further comprises:

recognizing two or more concepts in a document wherein said two or more concepts each represent a basic idea expressed in said document format (column 5, lines 57-65: "extracting for each of said unprocessed documents its features…in a feature vector");

recognizing a concept association for the two or more recognized concepts associated with a conceptual model that includes the concept association for the two or more recognized concepts (column 4, lines 65-67; column 6, lines 1-5; column 12, lines 17-67; column 13, lines 1-59: i.e. different concepts associated via the hierarchical clustered taxonomy);

indicating a concept type associated with said document using the conceptual model (column 5, lines 55-65: “unprocessed document with said category-scheme of said cluster”: i.e. the document is associated with a cluster with the most similar feature-vector; column 14, lines 25-65: "categorization tool assigns documents to predefined categories"); , wherein the concept type comprises a group of one or more concepts that represent a similar idea (column 2, lines 25-45: “cluster a generalized title or cluster label…group documents by subject"; column 14, lines 26-35: "assign documents to preexisting categories, sometimes called topics or themes").

Doerre also teaches for each of said two or more concepts, identifying a plurality of features in said document format, wherein said plurality of features represent evidence of said of

one or said two or more concepts in said format (column 5, lines 5-67: "extracting for each...unprocessed documents...features and computing its feature statistics in a feature-vector"; column 6, lines 1-8; column 17, lines 44-49; column 19, lines 47-65).

Doerre further teaches wherein the document could come from a multitude of documents (column 4, lines 30-32). Doerre does not specifically teach wherein the initial document format had to be converted to one of the common document format to be processed. Weiser et al teach converting a document format (email message) from an email format to a common generic format (column 12, lines 53-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Doerre to have converted a document's initial format to a common document format, because Weiser et al taught that by doing so the common format can be understandable by the document system (column 12, lines 44-56: i.e. converting a document to a format able to be processed by the a specific system provides the obvious advantage of being able to process the document in that system).

Doerre further teaches wherein recognizing and categorizing documents was well known to enhance further document searching and retrieval (column 8, lines 37-40: "powerful and flexible queries"; column 9, lines 1-3). Doerre does not specifically teach receiving a search query associated with said concept type and identifying based at least in part on the association of the concept type with said document, that said document is responsive to said search query. Chakrabarti et al teach wherein a search query was associated with said concept type identification (column 2, lines 23-28 & 58-60: "database of Web pages that is focused on a predefined topic or topics"; column 3, lines 52-57: "focused database…receiving a search query"; column 5, lines 13-27); identifying said concept at least in part by using said concept

identification of said search query (column 2, lines 58-60: "generate a database of Web pages that is focused on a predefined topic or topics"; column 5, lines 21-25: "a user can search the database 30 efficiently for Web pages of interest, i.e., only for Web pages relating to the topic of which the database 30 was focuses"); utilizing the conceptual model (column 4, lines 61-66; column 5, lines 13-27) to determine that said document was associated with said identified concept (column 2, lines 58-60; column 3, lines 52-57: column 5, lines 13-27); and concluding at least in part on the determination that said document was associated with said identified concept, that said document was responsive to said search query (column 3, lines 52-57; column 4, lines 61-66; column 5, lines 13-27). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Doerre to have received a search query associated with said concept type for identifying said concept at least in part by using said identification, because Chakrabarti et al teach that utilizing models (Fig. 1: 35B & 35B) to associated documents with a predefined topic or topics (i.e. concepts) allows efficient searching of said topics by users (column 2, lines 58-60; column 3, lines 52-57).

Doerre teaches extracting features from a document and establishing a plurality of thresholds to be associated with said features (column 13, lines 24-54) by comparing said feature vectors/concept weights with a predetermined threshold (column 5, lines 28-32 & 42-67; column 6, lines 1-8; column 17, lines 44-49; column 19, lines 47-65). Doerre does not specifically teach calculating a concept weight for one of said two or more concepts using a plurality of feature weights associated with said plurality of features wherein said concept weight represents a recognition confidence level for one of said two or more concepts and comparing said concept weight with a predetermined thresholds. Russell-Falla et al teaches calculating a concept

weight/confidence level for one of said two or more concepts ("calculating a rating of the page")(column 3, lines 54-57) using a plurality of feature weights ("requires a weighting be provided for each word of phrase in the list")(column 3, lines 46-57) associated with said plurality of features ("regular expressions")(column 2, lines 55-59; column 8, lines 9-19) wherein said concept weight represents a recognition confidence level for one of said two or more concepts (column 3, lines 54-57) and comparing said concept weight with a predetermined thresholds (column 2, lines 64-67; column 3, lines 1-16). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Doerre to have calculated a weighting for the unprocessed documents feature values to be compared to threshold values as taught in Russell-Falla, because Russell-Falla taught that through user selectable threshold values a documents relevance could more easily tailored to a specific user (column 2, lines 64-67; column 3, lines 1-16).

Neither Doerre nor Russell-Falla teach wherein the recognition confidence level for each of said two or more concepts was calculated for each paragraph of the common document format. McKeown et al taught segmenting text documents into paragraphs, identifying the significance of specified categories of information in said paragraphs, assigning weighted scores to paragraphs of the input document, and summing the scores of the individual paragraphs for the input document (column 2, lines 35-50; column 3, lines 65-67; column 4, lines 4-15, 29-34, & 45-57; column 5, lines 9-45; column 6, lines 21-30 & 53-57; column 7, lines 1-15 & 38-63). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the confidence level scoring of documents for specific concepts of Doerre and Russell-Falla to have been calculated on the paragraph level of said documents as shown in McKeown et al, because

McKeown et al taught that segmenting document scores by paragraphs provided the benefit of "efficiently and accurately" identifying topics in an input document (column 2, lines 30-34) which provided the additional well known benefit of helping text search engines process input queries to locate specific topics in a given document (column 1, lines 40-50: "be useful in assisting text search…useful in assisting summary agents").

-In regard to dependent claims 4 and 19, Doerre teaches based on conceptual model, generating an auto-attribute, said auto-attribute being a descriptive label for said document (column 2, lines 25-45: "cluster a generalized title or cluster label…group documents by subject"; column 14, lines 26-35: "assign documents to preexisting categories, sometimes called topics or themes").

-In regard to dependent claims 5, 18, and 20, Doerre teaches based on said conceptual model assigning said common format document to a subject category in a directory (column 13, lines 1-24; column 14, lines 26-65).

-In regard to dependent claim 8, Doerre teaches wherein said conceptual model includes a concept dictionary (column 14, lines 57-65: "category scheme is a dictionary").

-In regard to dependent claim 11, Doerre teaches wherein the conceptual model includes a noise dictionary (column 6, lines 37-47).

-In regard to dependent claim 12, Doerre teaches assigning a subject category to said document based at least in part upon said conceptual model (column 12, lines 61-67; column 13, lines 1-54).

-In regard to dependent claim 13, Doerre teaches wherein assigning the subject category follows an auto-categorization rule (column 5, lines 55-67; column 6, lines 1-3; column 14, lines 57-67; column 15, lines 1-20).

-In regard to dependent claim 15, as shown above, Doerre teaches wherein the document could come from a multitude of documents over the Internet (column 1, lines 18-24; column 4, lines 30-32). Doerre does not specifically teach wherein the initial document format had to be converted to one of the common document format to be processed. Weiser et al teach converting a document format (email message) from an email format to a common generic format (column 12, lines 53-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Doerre to have converted a document's initial format to a common document format, because Weiser et al taught that by doing so the common format can be understandable by the document system (column 12, lines 44-56: i.e. converting a document to a format able to be processed by the a specific system provides the obvious advantage of being able to process the document in that system).

-In regard to dependent claim 16, Doerre teaches separating the text content from said initial format document for categorizing documents based on text analysis techniques (column 5,

lines 55-65: "extracting for each of said unprocessed documents its features"; column 9, lines 5-67; column 10, lines 1-67; column 11, lines 1-61). As shown above in dependent claim 15, Doerre does not teach converting the initial document format into a common document format. Weiser et al teach converting a document format (email message) from an email format to a common generic format (column 12, lines 53-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Doerre to have converted its initial format document to one of the common document formats listed above, because Weiser et teach by doing so the common format can be understandable by the document system (column 12, lines 44-56)(i.e. converting document to a format able to be processed by the a specific system provides the obvious advantage of being able to process the document in that system), wherein it would have also been obvious to incorporate the text from the initial document into the said common document, because Doerre teaches the textual content was what was needed to categorize the incoming documents (column 9: Section "Text Analysis Functions").

-In regard to dependent claim 21, Doerre teaches wherein the conceptual model includes a concept association dictionary (column 13, lines 1-24: "tree constructed…contains the complete clustering information including all inter- and intra-cluster similarities").

-In regard to dependent claim 10, Doerre teaches setting specific threshold values for concept inclusion into the conceptual model at a plurality levels based on exceeding and or meeting certain thresholds (column 13, lines 1-55: "set of singleton clusters each containing a single documents…allows the user to set…thresholds of intra-cluster similarity")

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doerre et al (US-6,446,061 09/03/02) in view of Weiser et al (US-5,982,507 11/09/99) in view of in further view of Chakrabarti et al (US-6,418,433 07/09/02) in further view of Russell-Falla et al (US-6,675,162 01/06/04) in further view of McKeown et al (US-6,473,730 10/29/02) in further view of W3C's, "Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0", 02/10/98, pp. 1-2, http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-xml-19980210.

-In regard to dependent claim 6, Doerre teaches wherein the document could come from a multitude of documents over the Internet (column 1, lines 18-25; column 4, lines 30-32). Doerre does not specifically teach wherein a common format was an XML document. W3C teaches wherein using XML was notoriously well known in the art for web applications (pp. 2: Section 1.1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for one of the common formats of Doerre to have been XML, because W3C teaches that the XML format provides the benefits of being easy to create, being easy to write programs which process XML documents, and being human-legible and reasonably clear (pp. 2: Section 1.1). It was also notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that XML was an International document standard.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant's arguments filed 02/09/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-In regard to independent claims 1, 7, and 14, the Appellant argues that Doerre and Chakrabarti fail to teach or suggest "receiving a search query associated with a concept type and identifying, based at least in part on the association of the concept type with a document, that the document is responsive to a search query". The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Appellant. Doerre clearly taught evaluating a document's features/concepts and categorizing said document into a given cluster in generated taxonomy, wherein said clusters of said generated taxonomy maintain documents of content/concept similarity (column 4, lines 31-52; column 12, lines 17-27; column 17, lines 7-49)(Fig. 2). Doerre also taught that by automatically generating said document taxonomy and by assigning documents to different clusters/nodes of said taxonomy, said structure could help improve the quality of information retrieval systems by being able to focus on specific parts of information (column 2, lines 38-45 & 57-61: "improve the quality of information retrieval" & "query refinement"; column 8, lines 37-40: "search for relevant documents using powerful and flexible queries"; column 9, lines 1-4 & 19-23: "index for ad-hoc searching" & "restricting search results by language"). Thus Doerre teaches a user being able to query the hierarchical taxonomy of document clusters, wherein each document cluster contained documents that were closely related to each other based on various concepts/features.

In view of what has been described above, the Examiner agrees that the Doerre reference alone does not specifically teach "receiving a search query associated with a concept type and identifying, based at least in part on the association of the concept type with a document, that the document is responsive to a search query". However the Chakrabarti reference has been relied upon to clearly teach these features in view of Doerre. Chakrabarti teaches generating a database of web pages, wherein a specific database was focused on a predefined topic or topics (column 2, lines 54-60: "generate a database of Web Pages that is focused on a predefined topic or topics, for subsequent efficient searching of the database by users"; column 3, lines 51-57; column 4, lines 61-67; column 5, lines 13-27; column 6, lines 35-51)(Fig. 1). Chakrabarti also teaches wherein a focused web crawler accessed a topic analyzer, which examines the content of the crawled web pages and compares it to the predefined topic or topics of the databases. Depending on how relevant a given web page is to a predefined topic or topics, said web page is either included as relevant in the focused database or excluded as non-relevant to the focused database (column 4, lines 61-67; column 5, lines 13-27). Thus a given crawled web page was associated with the concept type (i.e. topic or topics) of a given database based on whether or not said web page was stored in said database. Finally, Chakrabarti teaches wherein a user could submit a search query for information (column 3, lines 51-56: "receiving a search query form a user…"accessing a crawl database containing only information pertaining to…predefined topics"; column 5, lines 21-25: "a user can search the database 30 efficiently for Web pages of interest, i.e., only for Web pages relating to the topic of which the database 30 was focuses"; column 6, lines 35-45: "user can generate a query for information"), the search query associated with a predefined concept(s)/topic(s)(column 5, lines 21-25: "a user can search the database 30

efficiently for Web pages of interest, i.e., only for Web pages relating to the topic of which the database 30 was focuses"; column 6, lines 35-50: "quickly respond to the query when the query is related to the predefined topic"), and determining that said document was associated with said query (column 3, lines 52-57; column 6, lines 35-50: "quickly respond to the query when the query is related to the predefined topic…otherwise, for queries unrelated to the topic, no response will be available from the database")(emphasis added). In general, the user of Chakrabarti could decide to search a focused database of web pages on a given concept/topic based on said search query. If said document was associated (i.e. relevant content) with said topic and thus stored in said focused database, said document, based on said association, would be responsive to the search query. If said document was not associated (i.e. non-relevant content) with said concept/topic and thus not stored in said focused database, said document, based on said association, would not be responsive to the search query. Chakrabarti teaches that by associating databases and documents with any number of concepts/topics a user gained the benefit of being able to efficiently search only topics of interest to said user (column 2, lines 58-60; column 3, lines 52-57).

-In regard to the claims 1, 4-8, 10-16, and 18-21, the Appellant argues that there is a lack of motivation to combine the Doerre reference with the prior art references of Weiser, Chakrabarti, or Russell-Falla. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Appellant.

In response to Appellant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching,

suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Doerre teaches a system whereby a plurality of electronic documents stored on computers systems are categorized and stored as a hierarchical taxonomy (Abstract; column 4, lines 30-55). Doerre further teaches wherein the "multitude of documents" documents to be processed could be in different formats (column 1, lines 18-36: "information from any source...documents, e-mail, web pages, and other"; column 4, lines 31-32: "multitude of documents"; column 9, lines 9-23: i.e. different languages). As discussed above, Doerre does not specifically teach wherein the initial document format had to be converted to one of a common document format to be processed. Weiser et al has been relied upon to teach the notoriously well-known technique of converting a document in a given format to a common generic format (column 12, lines 53-56). Weiser teaches that it was well known for different computer applications to generate documents/content in a plurality of different formats and that it was necessary for a central processing system to convert said different document/content formats into a generic common format understandable by the processing system (column 12, lines 41-56). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the document taxonomy generation system of Doerre to have converted any incompatible initial document formats in the computer systems to a common document format, because Weiser et al taught that by doing so the common format could be understandable by the document processing system (column 12, lines 44-56: i.e. converting a document to a format able to be processed by the a specific system provides the obvious advantage of being able to

process the document in that system). Thus the system of Doerre would gain the benefit of being able to process a larger scope of documents which in turn would help create a more in depth document taxonomy for user interaction.

With regard to the combination of Doerre and Chakrabarti, the Examiner notes that Doerre clearly taught evaluating a document's features/concepts and categorizing said document into a given cluster in generated taxonomy, wherein said clusters of said generated taxonomy maintain documents of content/concept similarity (column 4, lines 31-52; column 12, lines 17-27; column 17, lines 7-49)(Fig. 2). Doerre also taught that by automatically generating said document taxonomy and by assigning documents to different clusters/nodes of said taxonomy, said structure could help improve the quality of information retrieval systems by being able to focus on specific parts of information (column 2, lines 38-45 & 57-61: "improve the quality of information retrieval" & "query refinement"; column 8, lines 37-40: "search for relevant documents using powerful and flexible queries"; column 9, lines 1-4 & 19-23: "index for ad-hoc searching" & "restricting search results by language"). Thus Doerre teaches a user being able to query the hierarchical taxonomy of document clusters, wherein each document cluster contained documents that were closely related to each other based on various concepts/features. Chakrabarti et al taught wherein a search query was associated with a concept type identification (column 2, lines 23-28 & 58-60: "database of Web pages that is focused on a predefined topic or topics"; column 3, lines 52-57: "focused database…receiving a search query"; column 5, lines 13-27); identifying said concept at least in part by using said concept identification of said search query (column 2, lines 58-60: "generate a database of Web pages that is focused on a predefined topic or topics"; column 5, lines 21-25: "a user can search the database 30 efficiently for Web

pages of interest, i.e., only for Web pages relating to the topic of which the database 30 was focuses"; column 6, lines 35-50: "quickly respond to the query when the query is related to the predefined topic…otherwise, for queries unrelated to the topic, no response will be available from the database"); utilizing a conceptual model (column 4, lines 61-66; column 5, lines 13-27) to determine that said document was associated with said identified concept (column 2, lines 58-60; column 3, lines 52-57: column 5, lines 13-27); and concluding at least in part on the determination that said document was associated with said identified concept, that said document was responsive to said search query (column 3, lines 52-57; column 4, lines 61-66; column 5, lines 13-27; column 6, lines 35-50: "quickly respond to the query when the query is related to the predefined topic…otherwise, for queries unrelated to the topic, no response will be available from the database"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Doerre to have received a search query associated with said concept type for identifying said concept at least in part by using said identification, because Chakrabarti et al teach that utilizing models (Fig. 1: 35B & 35B) to associated documents with a predefined topic or topics (i.e. concepts) allows efficient searching of said topics by users (column 2, lines 23-30 & 58-60: "efficient searching of the database by users"; column 3, lines 52-57; column 5, lines 14-25: "search the database effieicntly for web pages of interest"). Thus Chakrabarti teaches that by grouping documents by related topics of interest, a user could more efficiently search for specific information by only searching those areas which are relevant to the search query. Since Doerre groups documents by concepts/features into different hierarchical clusters, the user of Doerre could thus more easily/efficiently search information of interest by drilling down and

searching only the specific clusters in the taxonomy (i.e. areas already known by the system to contain unrelated and irrelevant data are not queried).

With regard to the combination of Doerre and Russell-Falla, the Examiner notes that Doerre teaches extracting features from a document and establishing a plurality of thresholds to be associated with said features (column 13, lines 24-54) by comparing said feature vectors/concept weights with a predetermined threshold (column 5, lines 28-32 & 42-67; column 6, lines 1-8; column 17, lines 44-49; column 19, lines 47-65). Doerre does not specifically teach calculating a concept weight for one of said two or more concepts using a plurality of feature weights associated with said plurality of features wherein said concept weight represents a recognition confidence level for one of said two or more concepts and comparing said concept weight with predetermined thresholds. Russell-Falla et al teaches calculating a concept weight/confidence level for one of said two or more concepts ("calculating a rating of the page")(column 3, lines 54-57) using a plurality of feature weights ("requires a weighting be provided for each word of phrase in the list")(column 3, lines 46-57) associated with said plurality of features ("regular expressions")(column 2, lines 55-59; column 8, lines 9-19) wherein said concept weight represents a recognition confidence level for one of said two or more concepts (column 3, lines 54-57) and comparing said concept weight with predetermined thresholds (column 2, lines 64-67; column 3, lines 1-16). It would have been obvious to one or ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Doerre to have calculated a weighting for the unprocessed documents feature values to be compared to threshold values as taught in Russell-Falla, because Russell-Falla taught that through user selectable threshold values a documents relevance could more easily tailored to a specific user (column 2, lines 64-67; column

3, lines 1-16). Thus Russell-Falla has been relied upon to teach a method by which the concept/feature weights of Doerre could be better calculated based on feature weights and threshold values (column 2, lines 35-43: "characterize a specific category of information...efficiently and accurately identify instances of that category"). In general the Examiner notes that the system of Russell-Falla also teaches "filtering, classifying, tracking" web pages based on particular selected categories of content (column 2, lines 30-43). Said web pages are analyzed for different features/concepts and are classified accordingly based on user set thresholds. Thus Appellant's assertion that said references are not related and are conflicted is believed to be unfounded.

-In regard to dependent claims 4 and 19, the Appellant argues that not all the claimed features are taught or suggested in the prior. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Appellant. Substantially similar claims 4 and 19, recite the limitations that, "based on said concept model, generating an auto-attribute, said auto-attribute being a descriptive label for said common document format." Doerre clearly shows that based on the generated concept model, auto-attributes were generated in the form of descriptive "labels" for said common document format was were incorporated into generated taxonomy (column 2, lines 24-45: "automatically…assigns to each cluster a generalized title or cluster label…group documents by subject"; column 6, lines 60-64: "advantages…labeling each node in the taxonomy hierarchy…usability of the generated taxonomy"; column 14, lines 15-35: "a cluster can be labeled with the lexical affinities it contains, which allows a user to quickly assed the characteristics of the cluster...assign documents to preexisting categories, sometimes called

topics or themes"; column 16, lines 21-24: "nodes…reflect 'concepts'…labeled so that the labels of the nodes give sufficient orientation for a user traversing the taxonomy"; column 17, lines 30-49: i.e. "label generation"; column 20, lines 58-67). Thus Doerre clearly shows automatically generating an auto-attribute in the form of cluster or node label within the generated categorized taxonomy, wherein the classified/assigned common format document was associated with said generated label when said document was routed/assigned to a given node or cluster within said categorized taxonomy. As shown above in the given citations, Doerre taught that benefits of the generating the descriptive labels helped a given user more easily understand, search, and/or navigate the generated taxonomy structure.

Appellant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references. In general the Appellant does not clearly point out which claimed features of dependent claims 4 and 19 are not taught in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited. Appellant merely states, without clear support within the claims, that "generating rule-based attributes automatically is different from labeling or naming subject group clusters."

In response to Appellant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of Appellant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which Appellant relies (i.e. "auto-attribute can assign…for example, rules and that labels can include labels of interest such as 'Useful Document'") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Adam L Basehoar/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178

06/17/09

Conferees:

Stephen Hong, Supervisory Patent Examiner for GAU 2178

Doug Hutton, Supervisory Patent Examiner for GAU 2176